Existence Is Infinite

Moderators: AMod, iMod

Post Reply | Search this topic… | 731 posts 1 … 23 24 25 26 27 … 49

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **daniel j lavender** » Mon Dec 30, 2024 2:25 pm

daniel j lavender
Posts: 290
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm
Location: Tennessee
Contact:

> Eodnhoj7 **wrote:** ↑ Mon Dec 30, 2024 6:53 am
> Question to AI:
>
> **If a dualism allows the contrast of opposites to result in a finite distinction** does the dualism of infinity and finiteness result in a paradoxical finite state for infinity thus infinity effectively becomes a meaningless concept as it cannot be truly conceptualized and conceptuality requires meaning, and mathematical and philosophical frameworks using it do not have a justifiable proof when using it other than finite practicality that is a further paradox to the infinite as only the finite occurs thus infinity is not truly axiomatic?
>
> Summary: Potentially and probably yes it may be meaningless and not truly axiomatic
>
> Copy and paste into "philosophy teacher ai" on Google search for full analysis.

“If a dualism allows the contrast of opposites to result in a finite distinction…”

That’s the key phrase and that which drives the remainder of the premise and the conclusion of A.I.

As previously expressed, user input influences A.I. conclusions. That is the case here.

Dualism is unified as existence. It is existence. Existence is both part and whole. Existence is unlimited. Existence is infinite. Thus existence being the subject matter and infinite being the descriptor as explained earlier.

You seem to be focused on parts and their limitations rather than how parts contribute to the unlimitedness of existence.

You are referencing two interrelated concepts, in turn acknowledging at least two distinctions, then presenting the two distinctions as a single distinction, a finite distinction. Then suggesting that single, finite distinction merely limits existence. It is an erroneous premise resulting in an erroneous A.I. conclusion.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Eodnhoj7** » Wed Jan 01, 2025 5:57 am

Eodnhoj7
Posts: 9903
Joined: Mon Mar 13, 2017 3:18 am

> daniel j lavender **wrote:** ↑ Sun Dec 29, 2024 7:11 am
>
>> Eodnhoj7 **wrote:** ↑ Sat Dec 28, 2024 6:32 am
>> Change requires nothingness for movement cannot occur if something is already there.
>
> This has already been discussed:
>
>> daniel j lavender **wrote:** ↑ Sun Dec 01, 2024 3:24 pm
>>
>>> Eodnhoj7 **wrote:** ↑ Wed Aug 09, 2023 10:38 pm
>>> …a thing cannot change if something is already filling its spot for potential change; one cannot walk through a door way without the door way being empty.
>>
>> Empty of what? Debris? Other people? Air? Matter? Space? Existence?
>>
>> Existence is everywhere. A door way is a door way. A thing. Existence. Not nothingness. The area or space within the door way is an area or space within the door way. A thing. Existence. Not nothingness.
>>
>> The appropriate term here would be unobstructed, not empty. The door way would be unobstructed.
>>
>> Change, motion always occurs upon the infrastructure of existence, not nonexistence.
>
> Immateriality, immaterial expanse explained here:
>
> viewtopic.php?p=653553#p653553
>
> viewtopic.php?p=657242#p657242
>
> Immaterial space, or immaterial expanse, permeates existence. Immateriality, not nothingness, is the contrast of materiality. Immaterial space has no matter or resistance allowing material bodies movement.
>
> By your own premise if there was nothingness there would be no things to move.

Immaterial is another word for nothingness. What is material is a thing.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Eodnhoj7** » Wed Jan 01, 2025 5:59 am

Eodnhoj7
Posts: 9903
Joined: Mon Mar 13, 2017 3:18 am

> daniel j lavender **wrote:** ↑ Mon Dec 30, 2024 2:25 pm
>
>> Eodnhoj7 **wrote:** ↑ Mon Dec 30, 2024 6:53 am
>> Question to AI:
>>
>> **If a dualism allows the contrast of opposites to result in a finite distinction** does the dualism of infinity and finiteness result in a paradoxical finite state for infinity thus infinity effectively becomes a meaningless concept as it cannot be truly conceptualized and conceptuality requires meaning, and mathematical and philosophical frameworks using it do not have a justifiable proof when using it other than finite practicality that is a further paradox to the infinite as only the finite occurs thus infinity is not truly axiomatic?
>>
>> Summary: Potentially and probably yes it may be meaningless and not truly axiomatic
>>
>> Copy and paste into "philosophy teacher ai" on Google search for full analysis.
>
> “If a dualism allows the contrast of opposites to result in a finite distinction…”
>
> That’s the key phrase and that which drives the remainder of the premise and the conclusion of A.I.
>
> As previously expressed, user input influences A.I. conclusions. That is the case here.
>
> Dualism is unified as existence. It is existence. Existence is both part and whole. Existence is unlimited. Existence is infinite. Thus existence being the subject matter and infinite being the descriptor as explained earlier.
>
> You seem to be focused on parts and their limitations rather than how parts contribute to the unlimitedness of existence.
>
> You are referencing two interrelated concepts, in turn acknowledging at least two distinctions, then presenting the two distinctions as a single distinction, a finite distinction. Then suggesting that single, finite distinction merely limits existence. It is an erroneous premise resulting in an erroneous A.I. conclusion.

The response to this found in the "infinity as a concept is paradoxical and not truly axiomatic" thread. Ai backs up my point. Your definition that "existence is infinite" is grounded in a concept of "infinity" that is not truly a concept or axiomatic.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **daniel j lavender** » Wed Jan 01, 2025 8:19 am

daniel j lavender
Posts: 290
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm
Location: Tennessee
Contact:

> Eodnhoj7 **wrote:** ↑ Sun Dec 29, 2024 4:41 am
>
>> daniel j lavender **wrote:** ↑ Sun Dec 29, 2024 4:23 am
>>
>>> Eodnhoj7 **wrote:** ↑ Sun Dec 29, 2024 1:55 am
>>> Infinity is a thing as it is a concept or experience. If a thing is limited by its opposite, as you have argued about the nature of contradiction not being infinite as non contradiction applies limits to it, thus infinity is not infinite...a contradiction.
>>
>> A concept is a concept. A concept is a thing. A thing is limited by definition as articulated in the original essay.
>>
>> Existence extends beyond concepts and terms. Again, existence is all things. Existence is infinite. Existence is not limited to any particular, including any concept. Even if the concept has a conceptual counterpart.
>>
>> Concepts and terms indicate things, they represent things, they mean things. The term apple indicates the fruit, for example. This is commonly understood. Likewise the term existence indicates all things, each and every thing including the term itself and the entirety of things as expressed in the essay.
>>
>> The term, the word, the concept itself as a thing is limited. That which the term represents is unlimited.
>>
>> Infinite is defined as unlimited or not limited. Infinite is not limited, not restricted. Infinite is inclusive. Infinite includes finite. Infinite includes finite parts. The extents and variations of those finite parts contribute to or comprise what is infinite. Review the Variance Of Existence section of the essay.
>>
>> An analogy can be drawn using mathematics. In mathematical set theory an infinite set can contain finite sets. However this is not entirely the same and it should be noted that the infinite set is a set, a thing. Existence, or infinite being, is not just a thing. Infinite, existence transcends mere mathematics. Further existence is not a container of things. Existence is the things.
>
> If existence is all things than it does not extend beyond all things as you claim it does.

Existence is all things, all aspects, all features. Existence is each and every thing and the entirety of things.

Existence is part *and* whole. Existence is a thing *and* all things. Existence is infinite.

> Eodnhoj7 **wrote:** ↑ Sun Dec 29, 2024 4:41 am
> If it does extend beyond all things, it is not a thing and essentially nothing...at which point it cannot be infinite as infinity is a quality and a quality can only be applied to things.

Interesting statement and nearly correct, at that point.

Existence essentially is.

As expressed many times, existence just *is*.

Infinite and finite, late and early, good and bad, etcetera, are complexities encountered by conscious beings, constructs created concerning orientation. Existence simply is.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **daniel j lavender** » Wed Jan 01, 2025 8:28 am

daniel j lavender
Posts: 290
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm
Location: Tennessee
Contact:

> Eodnhoj7 **wrote:** ↑ Wed Jan 01, 2025 5:57 am
> Immaterial is another word for nothingness. What is material is a thing.

Immaterial is immaterial, not tangible or material.

A thing is *an existing, material or immaterial; a part of existence. That which is perceived or interacted with, at least in part, in some way. E.g. a word, an object, matter, energy, consciousness, a concept, an event, a process, etcetera.*

Something and nothing cannot coexist.

There cannot be nothing, or nothingness, next to something. There would be something, there would be things or a thing, not no thing.

The referenced premise presents a door way and apparently nothing or nothingness within the door way. That is false. At the very least there would be air or space within the door way.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **daniel j lavender** » Wed Jan 01, 2025 9:00 am

daniel j lavender
Posts: 290
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm
Location: Tennessee
Contact:

> Eodnhoj7 **wrote:** ↑ Wed Jan 01, 2025 5:59 am
>
>> daniel j lavender **wrote:** ↑ Mon Dec 30, 2024 2:25 pm
>>
>>> Eodnhoj7 **wrote:** ↑ Mon Dec 30, 2024 6:53 am
>>> Question to AI:
>>>
>>> **If a dualism allows the contrast of opposites to result in a finite distinction** does the dualism of infinity and finiteness result in a paradoxical finite state for infinity thus infinity effectively becomes a meaningless concept as it cannot be truly conceptualized and conceptuality requires meaning, and mathematical and philosophical frameworks using it do not have a justifiable proof when using it other than finite practicality that is a further paradox to the infinite as only the finite occurs thus infinity is not truly axiomatic?
>>>
>>> Summary: Potentially and probably yes it may be meaningless and not truly axiomatic
>>>
>>> Copy and paste into "philosophy teacher ai" on Google search for full analysis.
>>
>> “If a dualism allows the contrast of opposites to result in a finite distinction…”
>>
>> That’s the key phrase and that which drives the remainder of the premise and the conclusion of A.I.
>>
>> As previously expressed, user input influences A.I. conclusions. That is the case here.
>>
>> Dualism is unified as existence. It is existence. Existence is both part and whole. Existence is unlimited. Existence is infinite. Thus existence being the subject matter and infinite being the descriptor as explained earlier.
>>
>> You seem to be focused on parts and their limitations rather than how parts contribute to the unlimitedness of existence.
>>
>> You are referencing two interrelated concepts, in turn acknowledging at least two distinctions, then presenting the two distinctions as a single distinction, a finite distinction. Then suggesting that single, finite distinction merely limits existence. It is an erroneous premise resulting in an erroneous A.I. conclusion.
>
> The response to this found in the "infinity as a concept is paradoxical and not truly axiomatic" thread. Ai backs up my point.

Your result extends from an erroneous premise as illustrated above.

A.I. output is approximate to the input. User interaction largely determines the result. A.I. is not completely reliable. At least not at this stage. Try processing text with a 3,000 plus word count, for example. A.I. will often skip entire sections of the text failing to include large portions of information in its evaluation.

> Eodnhoj7 **wrote:** ↑ Wed Jan 01, 2025 5:59 am
> Your definition that "existence is infinite" is grounded in a concept of "infinity" that is not truly a concept or axiomatic.

Infinite and infinity certainly are concepts. They are perceived.

You concede it is a concept:

> Eodnhoj7 **wrote:** ↑ Wed Jan 01, 2025 5:59 am
> is grounded in **a concept** of "infinity"

A concept remains a concept even if one may claim to disagree with it.

Your comment from the other thread:

> Eodnhoj7 **wrote:** ↑ Wed Jan 01, 2025 6:28 am
> If conception is finite than any conception of infinity is a contradictory abstraction.

As stated a concept is a concept. A concept is limited, a concept is a thing.

However what the concept indicates or represents extends beyond just the concept or term.

Contradiction and paradox have been addressed here: viewtopic.php?p=745919#p745919

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Eodnhoj7** » Wed Jan 01, 2025 4:44 pm

Eodnhoj7
Posts: 9903
Joined: Mon Mar 13, 2017 3:18 am

> daniel j lavender **wrote:** ↑ Wed Jan 01, 2025 8:19 am
>
>> Eodnhoj7 **wrote:** ↑ Sun Dec 29, 2024 4:41 am
>>
>>> daniel j lavender **wrote:** ↑ Sun Dec 29, 2024 4:23 am
>>>
>>> A concept is a concept. A concept is a thing. A thing is limited by definition as articulated in the original essay.
>>>
>>> Existence extends beyond concepts and terms. Again, existence is all things. Existence is infinite. Existence is not limited to any particular, including any concept. Even if the concept has a conceptual counterpart.
>>>
>>> Concepts and terms indicate things, they represent things, they mean things. The term apple indicates the fruit, for example. This is commonly understood. Likewise the term existence indicates all things, each and every thing including the term itself and the entirety of things as expressed in the essay.
>>>
>>> The term, the word, the concept itself as a thing is limited. That which the term represents is unlimited.
>>>
>>> Infinite is defined as unlimited or not limited. Infinite is not limited, not restricted. Infinite is inclusive. Infinite includes finite. Infinite includes finite parts. The extents and variations of those finite parts contribute to or comprise what is infinite. Review the Variance Of Existence section of the essay.
>>>
>>> An analogy can be drawn using mathematics. In mathematical set theory an infinite set can contain finite sets. However this is not entirely the same and it should be noted that the infinite set is a set, a thing. Existence, or infinite being, is not just a thing. Infinite, existence transcends mere mathematics. Further existence is not a container of things. Existence is the things.
>>
>> If existence is all things than it does not extend beyond all things as you claim it does.
>
> Existence is all things, all aspects, all features. Existence is each and every thing and the entirety of things.
>
> Existence is part *and* whole. Existence is a thing *and* all things. Existence is infinite.
>
>> Eodnhoj7 **wrote:** ↑ Sun Dec 29, 2024 4:41 am
>> If it does extend beyond all things, it is not a thing and essentially nothing...at which point it cannot be infinite as infinity is a quality and a quality can only be applied to things.
>
> Interesting statement and nearly correct, at that point.
>
> Existence essentially is.
>
> As expressed many times, existence just *is*.
>
> Infinite and finite, late and early, good and bad, etcetera, are complexities encountered by conscious beings, constructs created concerning orientation. Existence simply is.

If your conclusion is strictly "existence just is" than quite frankly I would not be picking apart your argument as I have come to the same conclusion through alternative means. I do not think "existence is infinite" is accurate enough..."Existence just is" is accurate enough.

The reason why infinity complicates things is because of its conceptual aspects. It is not truly axiomatic. Existence is axiomatic however.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Eodnhoj7** » Wed Jan 01, 2025 4:57 pm

Eodnhoj7
Posts: 9903
Joined: Mon Mar 13, 2017 3:18 am

> daniel j lavender **wrote:** ↑ Wed Jan 01, 2025 8:28 am
>
>> Eodnhoj7 **wrote:** ↑ Wed Jan 01, 2025 5:57 am
>> Immaterial is another word for nothingness. What is material is a thing.
>
> Immaterial is immaterial, not tangible or material.
>
> A thing is *an existing, material or immaterial; a part of existence. That which is perceived or interacted with, at least in part, in some way. E.g. a word, an object, matter, energy, consciousness, a concept, an event, a process, etcetera.*
>
> Something and nothing cannot coexist.
>
> There cannot be nothing, or nothingness, next to something. There would be something, there would be things or a thing, not no thing.
>
> The referenced premise presents a door way and apparently nothing or nothingness within the door way. That is false. At the very least there would be air or space within the door way.

What is intangible is not a thing as it is indistinct.

As to something and nothing not being able to coexist:

1. There is nothing to coexist with absolute nothing as there is absolutely nothing for existence to coexist with in the absolute sense. Absolute nothingness is a term which is paradoxical.

2. Nothingness as relative is merely potentiality as a means for existence to actualize through change inducing movement. An atom is 99.9999... percent empty. A simple point in geometry is also empty. The emptiness is void, nothingness.

There is absolute nothingness and relative nothingness.

Absolutely we are on the same terms, relatively we differ.

But where we are on the same terms it is only in base appearance and not at the metalevel. The reason is the "totality as nothing paradox" I covered before.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Eodnhoj7** » Wed Jan 01, 2025 5:09 pm

Eodnhoj7
Posts: 9903
Joined: Mon Mar 13, 2017 3:18 am

> daniel j lavender **wrote:** ↑ Wed Jan 01, 2025 9:00 am
>
>> Eodnhoj7 **wrote:** ↑ Wed Jan 01, 2025 5:59 am
>>
>>> daniel j lavender **wrote:** ↑ Mon Dec 30, 2024 2:25 pm
>>>
>>> “If a dualism allows the contrast of opposites to result in a finite distinction…”
>>>
>>> That’s the key phrase and that which drives the remainder of the premise and the conclusion of A.I.
>>>
>>> As previously expressed, user input influences A.I. conclusions. That is the case here.
>>>
>>> Dualism is unified as existence. It is existence. Existence is both part and whole. Existence is unlimited. Existence is infinite. Thus existence being the subject matter and infinite being the descriptor as explained earlier.
>>>
>>> You seem to be focused on parts and their limitations rather than how parts contribute to the unlimitedness of existence.
>>>
>>> You are referencing two interrelated concepts, in turn acknowledging at least two distinctions, then presenting the two distinctions as a single distinction, a finite distinction. Then suggesting that single, finite distinction merely limits existence. It is an erroneous premise resulting in an erroneous A.I. conclusion.
>>
>> The response to this found in the "infinity as a concept is paradoxical and not truly axiomatic" thread. Ai backs up my point.
>
> Your result extends from an erroneous premise as illustrated above.
>
> A.I. output is approximate to the input. User interaction largely determines the result. A.I. is not completely reliable. At least not at this stage. Try processing text with a 3,000 plus word count, for example. A.I. will often skip entire sections of the text failing to include large portions of information in its evaluation.
>
>> Eodnhoj7 **wrote:** ↑ Wed Jan 01, 2025 5:59 am
>> Your definition that "existence is infinite" is grounded in a concept of "infinity" that is not truly a concept or axiomatic.
>
> Infinite and infinity certainly are concepts. They are perceived.
>
> You concede it is a concept:
>
>> Eodnhoj7 **wrote:** ↑ Wed Jan 01, 2025 5:59 am
>> is grounded in **a concept** of "infinity"
>
> A concept remains a concept even if one may claim to disagree with it.
>
> Your comment from the other thread:
>
>> Eodnhoj7 **wrote:** ↑ Wed Jan 01, 2025 6:28 am
>> If conception is finite than any conception of infinity is a contradictory abstraction.
>
> As stated a concept is a concept. A concept is limited, a concept is a thing.
>
> However what the concept indicates or represents extends beyond just the concept or term.
>
> Contradiction and paradox have been addressed here: viewtopic.php?p=745919#p745919

Of course user input influences AI, the AI operates similarly to a calculator and search engine combined. User input also effects people as it steers the course of arguments. If AI is faulty with large texts than quite frankly that is irrelevant as my question is not that long. But the thread also had the input of people who agreed with it.

If dualism is a unified existence, a paradox results because of monism. If all is one then truth is essentially illusion and anything goes as truth is untruth and if all is one then all is many.

Unlimited existence can only observe perpetual change conceptually as we only observe the finite and infinite regress is infinite potentiality where what is finite is always changing and yet is always finite. The reason why I focus on the parts is that is how all arguments are built, parts as concepts. To argue existence is infinite can only be done through finite paradoxes.

You are using a concept which is not truly a concept and what a abstracf concept represents is inherently subjective. You cannot use the word "infinity" and point to it so another understands what you mean as there is no limit to point to and one only can point to a limit.

"Paradoxes may not always be fallacious or false" does not justify your paradoxes as correct as the key word is "may". You are cherry picking some paradoxes as not fallacious and other's as being fallacious with no rationale. "The totality is nothing" can be argued as a non fallacious paradox.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **daniel j lavender** » Thu Jan 02, 2025 1:08 am

daniel j lavender
Posts: 290
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm
Location: Tennessee
Contact:

> Eodnhoj7 **wrote:** ↑ Wed Jan 01, 2025 4:44 pm
>
>> daniel j lavender **wrote:** ↑ Wed Jan 01, 2025 8:19 am
>>
>>> Eodnhoj7 **wrote:** ↑ Sun Dec 29, 2024 4:41 am
>>> If existence is all things than it does not extend beyond all things as you claim it does.
>>
>> Existence is all things, all aspects, all features. Existence is each and every thing and the entirety of things.
>>
>> Existence is part *and* whole. Existence is a thing *and* all things. Existence is infinite.
>>
>>> Eodnhoj7 **wrote:** ↑ Sun Dec 29, 2024 4:41 am
>>> If it does extend beyond all things, it is not a thing and essentially nothing...at which point it cannot be infinite as infinity is a quality and a quality can only be applied to things.
>>
>> Interesting statement and nearly correct, at that point.
>>
>> Existence essentially is.
>>
>> As expressed many times, existence just *is*.
>>
>> Infinite and finite, late and early, good and bad, etcetera, are complexities encountered by conscious beings, constructs created concerning orientation. Existence simply is.
>
> If your conclusion is strictly "existence just is" than quite frankly I would not be picking apart your argument as I have come to the same conclusion through alternative means. I do not think "existence is infinite" is accurate enough..."Existence just is" is accurate enough.

The conclusion is existence is infinite.

Yes, existence just is however all layers of complexity must be accounted for. To discount any aspect is to limit existence. All aspects are existence. Existence is infinite.

> Eodnhoj7 **wrote:** ↑ Wed Jan 01, 2025 4:44 pm
> The reason why infinity complicates things is because of its conceptual aspects. It is not truly axiomatic. Existence is axiomatic however.

Existence being infinite is axiomatic, it is self-evident truth.

You acknowledge that existence simply is. You accomplished such by thinking, by using your brain. That process may have been tedious, you may have experienced tedium.

You further expressed such acknowledgement by typing on a keyboard. The screen or keys were likely cool to the touch, a feeling, another experience and sensation indicating variation of temperature, indicating variance of existence supporting the premise that existence concerns nuance beyond simply being. Existence is not limited to any particular detail or variation. Your very interaction acknowledges both levels of being.

Existence includes detail, existence includes variation, existence includes multiples. All the variance is. You sense it, you observe it, you acknowledge it, you utilize it else you could not successfully interact in such a way as to communicate here.

Existence is not limited to neutrality. Although variance is it all balances as simply being. Existence, being infinite, concerns all aforementioned layers or levels. Both complexity and simplicity.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **daniel j lavender** » Thu Jan 02, 2025 1:35 am

daniel j lavender
Posts: 290
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm
Location: Tennessee
Contact:

> Eodnhoj7 **wrote:** ↑ Wed Jan 01, 2025 4:57 pm
>
>> daniel j lavender **wrote:** ↑ Wed Jan 01, 2025 8:28 am
>>
>>> Eodnhoj7 **wrote:** ↑ Wed Jan 01, 2025 5:57 am
>>> Immaterial is another word for nothingness. What is material is a thing.
>>
>> Immaterial is immaterial, not tangible or material.
>>
>> A thing is *an existing, material or immaterial; a part of existence. That which is perceived or interacted with, at least in part, in some way. E.g. a word, an object, matter, energy, consciousness, a concept, an event, a process, etcetera.*
>>
>> Something and nothing cannot coexist.
>>
>> There cannot be nothing, or nothingness, next to something. There would be something, there would be things or a thing, not no thing.
>>
>> The referenced premise presents a door way and apparently nothing or nothingness within the door way. That is false. At the very least there would be air or space within the door way.
>
> What is intangible is not a thing as it is indistinct.

The quality of being intangible is what makes such distinct.

A pineapple is tangible. The thought, the conceptual instance of the pineapple is not.

An object is an object. A concept is a concept. Both are perceived. Both are existence.

> Eodnhoj7 **wrote:** ↑ Wed Jan 01, 2025 4:57 pm
> As to something and nothing not being able to coexist:
>
> 1. There is nothing to coexist with absolute nothing as there is absolutely nothing for existence to coexist with in the absolute sense. Absolute nothingness is a term which is paradoxical.

Correct.

> Eodnhoj7 **wrote:** ↑ Wed Jan 01, 2025 4:57 pm
> 2. Nothingness as relative is merely potentiality as a means for existence to actualize through change inducing movement. An atom is 99.9999... percent empty. A simple point in geometry is also empty. The emptiness is void, nothingness.

Incorrect.

Nothingness is not relative. Nothingness is not and cannot be to any degree.

Emptiness indicates emptiness of something, in this case regions empty of matter. An atom contains mostly immaterial space. The regions in which there are no electrons or protons, etcetera are regions of immaterial space or immaterial expanse.

Immateriality is the opposite of physicality. Not nothingness. Immaterial space has no matter or resistance allowing material bodies movement.

Something and nothing cannot coexist.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Eodnhoj7** » Thu Jan 02, 2025 2:13 am

Eodnhoj7
Posts: 9903
Joined: Mon Mar 13, 2017 3:18 am

> daniel j lavender **wrote:** ↑ Thu Jan 02, 2025 1:08 am
>
>> Eodnhoj7 **wrote:** ↑ Wed Jan 01, 2025 4:44 pm
>>
>>> daniel j lavender **wrote:** ↑ Wed Jan 01, 2025 8:19 am
>>>
>>> Existence is all things, all aspects, all features. Existence is each and every thing and the entirety of things.
>>>
>>> Existence is part *and* whole. Existence is a thing *and* all things. Existence is infinite.
>>>
>>> Interesting statement and nearly correct, at that point.
>>>
>>> Existence essentially is.
>>>
>>> As expressed many times, existence just *is*.
>>>
>>> Infinite and finite, late and early, good and bad, etcetera, are complexities encountered by conscious beings, constructs created concerning orientation. Existence simply is.
>>
>> If your conclusion is strictly "existence just is" than quite frankly I would not be picking apart your argument as I have come to the same conclusion through alternative means. I do not think "existence is infinite" is accurate enough..."Existence just is" is accurate enough.
>
> The conclusion is existence is infinite.
>
> Yes, existence just is however all layers of complexity must be accounted for. To discount any aspect is to limit existence. All aspects are existence. Existence is infinite.
>
>> Eodnhoj7 **wrote:** ↑ Wed Jan 01, 2025 4:44 pm
>> The reason why infinity complicates things is because of its conceptual aspects. It is not truly axiomatic. Existence is axiomatic however.
>
> Existence being infinite is axiomatic, it is self-evident truth.
>
> You acknowledge that existence simply is. You accomplished such by thinking, by using your brain. That process may have been tedious, you may have experienced tedium.
>
> You further expressed such acknowledgement by typing on a keyboard. The screen or keys were likely cool to the touch, a feeling, another experience and sensation indicating variation of temperature, indicating variance of existence supporting the premise that existence concerns nuance beyond simply being. Existence is not limited to any particular detail or variation. Your very interaction acknowledges both levels of being.
>
> Existence includes detail, existence includes variation, existence includes multiples. All the variance is. You sense it, you observe it, you acknowledge it, you utilize it else you could not successfully interact in such a way as to communicate here.
>
> Existence is not limited to neutrality. Although variance is it all balances as simply being. Existence, being infinite, concerns all aforementioned layers or levels. Both complexity and simplicity.

If your conclusion was "existence is" we would be having either no discussion or primarily building a loop of agreement.

However it is not.

If "existence is" then saying "existence is x" creates a highly relativistic truth as it is highly conditional. It may be argued existence is not just infinite but finite or relative or absolute or coherent or paradoxical or whatever. Anything could be concluded.

Which leads to the next point: Existence is all aspects according to you thus necessitates infinite contradiction and illogic as many argue these things and these are realities. Discount aspects of reality is a part of reality.

As to the rest here:

Infinity is not self evident as self evidence requires conceptualization and infinity cannot be conceptualized without placing limits on it thus necessitating existence is finite. Existence is both infinite and finite. Existence is a dualism then but as a dualism results in a paradoxical monism as the relation of opposites is one. Reality is then both monistic and dualistic and as such is transitional thus making it triadic. As transitional it is transient and empty thus making it quadratic. Existence is thus fourfold in foundation.

Basically arguing existence is infinite is a very limited way of viewing it.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **daniel j lavender** » Thu Jan 02, 2025 2:16 am

daniel j lavender
Posts: 290
Joined: Sat Apr 16, 2022 3:20 pm
Location: Tennessee
Contact:

> Eodnhoj7 **wrote:** ↑ Wed Jan 01, 2025 5:09 pm
> You are using a concept which is not truly a concept and what a abstracf concept represents is inherently subjective.

It is a concept. The concept and terms have been clearly defined in the original essay.

> Eodnhoj7 **wrote:** ↑ Wed Jan 01, 2025 5:09 pm
> …there is no limit to point to and one only can point to a limit.

One can point to a thing, such as a pineapple, which clearly has limits. Simultaneously one is pointing to [part of] that which is unlimited.

> Eodnhoj7 **wrote:** ↑ Wed Jan 01, 2025 5:09 pm
> You are cherry picking some paradoxes as not fallacious and other's as being fallacious with no rationale.

If I’m cherry picking I have a full basket. Existence includes all contradiction and paradox whether congruent or not. By definition, sourced from Merriam Webster earlier in discussion, not all paradox is necessarily true.

> Eodnhoj7 **wrote:** ↑ Wed Jan 01, 2025 5:09 pm
> "The totality is nothing" can be argued as a non fallacious paradox.

Totality is not nothing. Totality is a term, a concept, a distinction.

Totality implicitly involves parts or things. Things are implied by total or whole. Whole, totality cannot be without parts. Whole, total is unification of things. As stated, existence is both part and whole.

By definition totality involves parts:

Totality (noun)
1 : an **aggregate** amount : SUM, **WHOLE**
2 a : the quality or state of being **total** : WHOLENESS
(Totality. Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary, Merriam-Webster, https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/totality)

Aggregate (adjective)
: formed by the **collection of units or particles** into a body, mass, or amount : COLLECTIVE
(Aggregate. Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary, Merriam-Webster, https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/aggregate)

Whole (adjective)
2 : having **all its proper parts** or components : COMPLETE, UNMODIFIED
(Whole. Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary, Merriam-Webster, https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/whole)

Whole (noun)
1 : a complete amount or sum : a number, aggregate, or totality **lacking no part**, member, or element
(Whole. Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary, Merriam-Webster, https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/whole)

Total (adjective)
1 : comprising or constituting a whole : ENTIRE
(Total. Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary, Merriam-Webster, https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/total)

Entire (adjective)
1 : having **no element or part left out** : WHOLE
(Entire. Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary, Merriam-Webster, https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/entire)

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Eodnhoj7** » Thu Jan 02, 2025 2:23 am

Eodnhoj7
Posts: 9903
Joined: Mon Mar 13, 2017 3:18 am

> daniel j lavender **wrote:** ↑ Thu Jan 02, 2025 1:35 am
>
>> Eodnhoj7 **wrote:** ↑ Wed Jan 01, 2025 4:57 pm
>>
>>> daniel j lavender **wrote:** ↑ Wed Jan 01, 2025 8:28 am
>>>
>>> Immaterial is immaterial, not tangible or material.
>>>
>>> A thing is *an existing, material or immaterial; a part of existence. That which is perceived or interacted with, at least in part, in some way. E.g. a word, an object, matter, energy, consciousness, a concept, an event, a process, etcetera.*
>>>
>>> Something and nothing cannot coexist.
>>>
>>> There cannot be nothing, or nothingness, next to something. There would be something, there would be things or a thing, not no thing.
>>>
>>> The referenced premise presents a door way and apparently nothing or nothingness within the door way. That is false. At the very least there would be air or space within the door way.
>>
>> What is intangible is not a thing as it is indistinct.
>
> The quality of being intangible is what makes such distinct.
>
> A pineapple is tangible. The thought, the conceptual instance of the pineapple is not.
>
> An object is an object. A concept is a concept. Both are perceived. Both are existence.
>
>> Eodnhoj7 **wrote:** ↑ Wed Jan 01, 2025 4:57 pm
>> As to something and nothing not being able to coexist:
>>
>> 1. There is nothing to coexist with absolute nothing as there is absolutely nothing for existence to coexist with in the absolute sense. Absolute nothingness is a term which is paradoxical.
>
> Correct.
>
>> Eodnhoj7 **wrote:** ↑ Wed Jan 01, 2025 4:57 pm
>> 2. Nothingness as relative is merely potentiality as a means for existence to actualize through change inducing movement. An atom is 99.9999... percent empty. A simple point in geometry is also empty. The emptiness is void, nothingness.
>
> Incorrect.
>
> Nothingness is not relative. Nothingness is not and cannot be to any degree.
>
> Emptiness indicates emptiness of something, in this case regions empty of matter. An atom contains mostly immaterial space. The regions in which there are no electrons or protons, etcetera are regions of immaterial space or immaterial expanse.
>
> Immateriality is the opposite of physicality. Not nothingness. Immaterial space has no matter or resistance allowing material bodies movement.
>
> Something and nothing cannot coexist.

Thoughts are bound to the physical and as such are tangible. What is truly intangible would be unknown.

Relative nothingness exists as the absence of a specific thing. Nothingness can be absolute (unchanging for there is no change or nothing to change, ie nothing is absolute) and relative (absence of a specific thing or an unactualized state).

Relative nothingness is how movement occurs and with movement comes distinction thus a thing.

Re: Existence Is Infinite

by **Eodnhoj7** » Thu Jan 02, 2025 2:30 am

Eodnhoj7
Posts: 9903
Joined: Mon Mar 13, 2017 3:18 am

> daniel j lavender **wrote:** ↑ Thu Jan 02, 2025 2:16 am
>
>> Eodnhoj7 **wrote:** ↑ Wed Jan 01, 2025 5:09 pm
>> You are using a concept which is not truly a concept and what a abstracf concept represents is inherently subjective.
>
> It is a concept. The concept and terms have been clearly defined in the original essay.
>
>> Eodnhoj7 **wrote:** ↑ Wed Jan 01, 2025 5:09 pm
>> …there is no limit to point to and one only can point to a limit.
>
> One can point to a thing, such as a pineapple, which clearly has limits. Simultaneously one is pointing to [part of] that which is unlimited.
>
>> Eodnhoj7 **wrote:** ↑ Wed Jan 01, 2025 5:09 pm
>> You are cherry picking some paradoxes as not fallacious and other's as being fallacious with no rationale.
>
> If I’m cherry picking I have a full basket. Existence includes all contradiction and paradox whether congruent or not. By definition, sourced from Merriam Webster earlier in discussion, not all paradox is necessarily true.
>
>> Eodnhoj7 **wrote:** ↑ Wed Jan 01, 2025 5:09 pm
>> "The totality is nothing" can be argued as a non fallacious paradox.
>
> Totality is not nothing. Totality is a term, a concept, a distinction.
>
> Totality implicitly involves parts or things. Things are implied by total or whole. Whole, totality cannot be without parts. Whole, total is unification of things. As stated, existence is both part and whole.
>
> By definition totality involves parts:
>
> Totality (noun)